



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,981	07/21/2003	Shun-Min Chen	7248	5525

7590 08/04/2005
Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens LLP
Suite 3300
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER

BROWN, PETER R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3636

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/623,981

Applicant(s)

CHEN, SHUN-MIN

Examiner

Peter R. Brown

Art Unit

3636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

The disclosure is objected to because the specification contains numerous grammatical errors and inconsistencies.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 10, it appears that "installed at the seat portion" should be changed to "installed *on* the seat portion", for clarity.

In line 11, "the pivotal piece" lacks antecedent basis. Moreover, the rods are not considered to be "connected to" the pivotal member, rather "slidably engaged with" the pivotal member.

In lines 14 and 15, the phrase "to make the rods be escaped...from the restriction of the pivotal member", is confusing and awkward.

The claim as a whole appears to be lacking sufficient structure to clearly and sufficiently define the invention. For example, in claiming the pivotal member and the rods engaged therewith, it would appear from the claim that the disconnection of the rods would result in removal of the seat from the frame, rather than a pivotal movement to a collapsed position. The claim does not distinguish or relatively locate the interconnection of the rods and the pivotal member in regards to the pivotal interconnection of the seat and the frame, and does not clarify the relationship therebetween. Also confusing is the language of claim 8 when taken

with that of claim 1, wherein the second engaging unit is activated to rotate the seat relative to the frame. It appears that both engaging units must be activated in order for the seat to rotate, in which case, claim 1 should recite both engaging units therein, as it appears that simply actuating the sliding rods would not allow seat rotation. It is suggested that claim 1 include the recitation of the first and second engaging units and the activation thereof for allowing seat rotation relative to the frame, wherein the details of the second engaging unit may remain in the dependent claims.

In claim 3, the phrase “wherein the first rod passes the sliding piece”, is confusing and unclear.

In claim 5, the “second engaging unit” has not been sufficiently interconnected to the cited elements, nor has it been located relative to the first engaging unit.

In claim 13, there is insufficient structure or means set forth for supporting the “movably fixed” function as claimed.


Claims 1-13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gill, McDonald, Perego, Brevi, Helmsderfer et al, Quinlan, Jr, Huang and Chen show various features of the invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter R. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-6853. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Peter R. Brown
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3636

prb